

E.O.B.
Treasury Department,

BUREAU OF THE MINT,

Washington, D. C., February 2^d, 1884.

Sir:

I have received your communication of the 1st instant, in reply to mine of the 31st ultimo, in relation to errors in calculating the charges to be imposed on certain deposits embraced on the abstract sheets accompanying your Bullion Accounts for the quarter ended September 30. 1883.

In relation to the charge of seventeen cents imposed on the deposit of July 17. 1883 made by George F. Craig, which should have been \$1.72, I would say that, rather than have any suspension or disallowance made in your accounts on account of it, I would suggest that, if possible, you collect the difference (\$1.55) from the person and carry it to the credit of your "Profit and loss account."

In relation to the manner of computing the "alloy charge" on the two deposits referred to in my letter I would say that your explanation does not cover the facts in the cases. The "alloy charge" is to be imposed, as you state, only on the number of ounces of copper required to reduce the deposit to the fineness of the bars required, which in the cases under consideration was sterling, 925 fine; but the point is that there has evidently been an error made in arriving at the number of ounces of copper required. For instance, take the deposit of July 17th of 516. ¹⁰/₁₀₀ ounces 999 fine, to be paid in sterling bars. The number of ounces of copper required to reduce this deposit to a standard of 925 fine would be 42, and at the rate of two cents an ounce the charge would be 84 cents. Take the deposit of August 9th made by the

Same person, 1027. ³⁰ ounces 999 fine. The number of ounces of copper required to reduce this deposit to sterling would be 83, the charge for which should be \$1.66.

In each case you have imposed a less charge than would seem to be correct. This would indicate that you have a different method of arriving at the number of ounces required to reduce a deposit to the standard desired than suggests itself to me, and one or the other must be wrong, and I desire to know how you arrive at the amount imposed in each of these cases — 77 cents and \$1.54 — in order to satisfy myself as to the proper method, and also to correct an erroneous method if it is in existence.

The last portion of the second paragraph of your letter, where you say "and the alloy" charge on the deposit of August 9th 1883 of

"1027.30 ounces is two cents per ounce on the
"fine silver in the deposit," is evidently a clerical
error, and I simply direct your attention to
it.

Very respectfully,
Horatio C. Bruchard
Director

Aboudon Snowden, Esq.,
Supt. Mint,
Philadelphia.

131

D. W.

Wash W. C.

Feb 2/84

Burchard

How to adjust error
 of 17¢ in 13¢ charge
 Bulletin Feb, 3rd 1883.
 Calculation of all
 charges, same matter,
 enormous.



[Abstract:] How to adjust error of 17¢ in Bar charge...

E.O.L.

Treasury Department,
Bureau of the Mint,
Washington, D.C.,
February 2, 1884

Sir:

I have received your communication of the 1st instant, in reply to mine of the 31st ultimo, in relation to errors in calculating the charges to be imposed on certain deposits embraced on the abstract sheets accompanying your Bullion Accounts for the quarter ended September 30, 1883.

In relation to the charge of seventeen cents imposed on the deposit of July 17, 1883 made by George F. Craig, which should have been \$1.72. I would say that, rather than have any suspension or disallowance made in your accounts on account of it, I would suggest that, if possible, you collect the difference (\$1.55) from the person and carry it to the credit of your "Profit and loss account."

In relation to the manner of computing the "alloy charge" on the two deposits referred to in my letter I would say that your explanation does not cover the facts in the cases. The "alloy charge" is to be imposed, as you state, only on the number of ounces of copper required to reduce the deposit to the fineness of the bars required, which in the cases under consideration was sterling, 925 fine; but the point is that there has evidently been an error made in arriving at the number of ounces of copper required. For instance, take the deposit of July 17th of 516.10 ounces 999 fine, to be paid in sterling bars. The number of ounces of copper required to reduce this deposit to a standard of 925 fine would be 42, and at the rate of two cents an ounce the charge would be 84 cents. Take the deposit of August 9th made by the same person, 1027.30 ounces 999 fine. The number of ounces of copper required to reduce this deposit to sterling would be 83, the charge for which should be \$1.66.

In each case you have imposed a less charge than would seem to be correct. This would indicate that you have a different method of arriving at the number of ounces required to reduce a deposit to the standard desired than suggests itself to me, and one or the other must be wrong, and I desire to know how you arrive at the amount imposed in each of these cases – 77 cents and \$1.54 – in order to satisfy myself as to the proper method, and also to correct an erroneous method if it is in existence.

The last portion of the second paragraph of your letter, where you say "and the alloy charge on the deposit of August 9th 1883 of 1027.30 ounces is two cents per ounce on the fine silver in the deposit," is evidently a clerical error, and I simply direct your attention to it.

NARA RG104, Entry 1, Box 130

Very respectfully,
Horatio C. Burchard
Director

A. Loudon Snowden, Esq.
Supt. Mint,
Philadelphia.